

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 1-7. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1-7.

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Wiegel (U.S. Patent No. 6,484,261). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 1-7 are not taught or suggested by Wiegel whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Amendments were made to each of the claims to clarify that according to present invention status information is obtained from the managed system and such status information is compared with prestored status information corresponding to the managed system and then the status information, namely the security status of the managed system, is modified based on a result of the comparison.

The above described features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Wiegel whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record.

Wiegel teaches a graphical network security policy management method and system for managing data communication policy for network devices. Specifically, Wiegel teaches a representation of a network security policy is provided in the form of a decision tree using graphical signals wherein a user is allowed to modify properties of the graphical symbols so as to create a logical representation of the

policy in other elements of the graphically displayed system. However, at no point in Wiegel is there any teaching or suggestion of the obtaining of status information from the managed system, the comparison of the status information of the managed system to prestored security status information, and the modifying of the security status of the managed system based upon the result of the comparison as in the present invention.

Thus, Wiegel fails to teach or suggest a management control section for obtaining from the managed system status information representing the security status of the managed system, comparing the status information obtained from the managed system to the management section extracted by the extraction section and changing the security status of the managed system corresponding to the management section based on a result of the comparison as recited in the claims.

Therefore, as is clear from the above, the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Wiegel whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claims 1-7 is respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the reference utilized in the rejection of claims 1-7.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 1-7 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1-7 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (566.39530X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 684-1120